

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,657	008,657 11/09/2001		Jeffrey Oliver	100.339US01	7351
34206	7590	01/24/2006		EXAMINER	
		ATES, LLC	ROBERTS, BRIAN S		
P.O. BOX 58 MINNEAPO	-	55458-1339		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2662	
				DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			/iC
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	\mathcal{U}^{C}
	10/008,657	OLIVER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian Roberts	2662	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	<u> 3 November 2005</u> .		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ T	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	wance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the meri	ts is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application	ion.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	drawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 March 2005</u> is/ard	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj	jected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the core	•	· · · · · ·	
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-15	2.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in A	pplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	·	received in this National Stage	•
application from the International Bur	, , , ,		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	The state of the s	

Art Unit: 2662

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-24 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan et al. (US 5727160) in view of Inoue (US 6252858).
 - In reference to claims 1,10,16, and 21

Ganesan et al. teaches in Figure 15

- An Input/Output port manager (IOPM 612) connected to the IO Cards (614)
 that indicates when T1 line failures occur by frequently polling the IO Cards (614) (column 15 lines 66-67)
- The IOPM (612) maintains and reports to the Operation Maintenance Center the status of the I/O ports (OMC 70) (column 16 lines 1-2)
- The IOPM (612) also monitors T1 I/O ports for alarm conditions and reports
 events to the OMC (70). The IOPM (612) may perform switchover for backup
 T1 cards in response to alarm conditions (column 16 lines 2-6)

Art Unit: 2662

Ganesan et al. does not explicitly a system information database adapted to refresh based on collected performance information and generate system status information.

Inoue teaches the concept of a network configuration database that frequently refreshes to keep up-to-date information. (column 1 lines 29-43)The database collects information about network elements and generates system status information. (column 4 lines 5-9) Furthermore, Inoue teaches a data retrieval and rearrangement unit (21) that generates fault information and offers necessary and sufficient information for troubleshooting activities. (column 13 line 63 – column 14 line 8)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the IOPM to include a system information database adapted to refresh based on collected performance data and generate system status information because it would allow the IOPM to monitor and periodically record status information and alarm conditions of the T1 I/O ports in a database and generate fault information that is reported the OMC to aid in troubleshooting.

- In reference to claims 2,12, and 20

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue teaches a system that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim. Ganesan et al. further teaches monitoring for failures and alarm conditions. (column 16 lines 2-4)

- In reference to claims 3,11,19, and 23

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue teaches a system that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim. Ganesan et al. further teaches the IOPM (612) performing switchover for backup T1 cards in response to alarm conditions or an operator request. (column 16 lines 4-6)

- In reference to claim 4

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue teaches a system that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim. Ganesan et al. further teaches the IOPM (612) monitoring the T1 I/O ports for alarm conditions and reporting the events to the OMC (70) (remote unit) (column 16 lines 1-4)

In reference to claims 6-8,14-15,17-18, and 22

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue teaches a system that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim. Ganesan et al. further teaches hardware components comprising T1 cards. (column 15 lines 66-67)

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue does not teach E1 cards or the T1 cards including a driver.

Official Notice is taken that an E1 card is the European equivalent to a T1 card and that each card contains a driver.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of the combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue to include E1 cards or the T1 cards containing drivers because it would allow the system to be deployed in Europe and conform to the European communication standards and allow the T1 cards to have the necessary software to function.

In reference to claim 9

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue teaches a system that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim. In Figure 15, Ganesan et al. further teaches an interface between the IOPM (612) and T1 cards.

- 3. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan et al. (US 5727160) in view of Inoue (US 6252858), as applied to the parent claims, and further in view of Chang et al. (US 6167279)
 - In reference to claims 5 and 13

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue teaches a system that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim.

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue does not teach an embedded operations channel.

In Figure 1, Chang et al. teaches an embedded operations channel between a radio port (3) and radio port controller unit (4). (column 4 lines 8-11)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of the combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue to include a embedded operations channel as taught by Chang et al. because the

Art Unit: 2662

embedded operations channel provides a specific administration and maintenance channel to transmit system status information and alarm conditions.

4. Claims 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan et al. (US 5727160) in view of Inoue (US 6252858), as applied to the parent claims, and further in view of Major et al. (US 5455932).

- In reference to claim 24

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue teaches a system that covers substantially all limitations of the parent claim.

The combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue does not explicitly teach a message queue to receive alarm change messages.

Major et al. teaches a message queue to receive messages in a fault-tolerant data processing system. (abstract)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the IOPM (612) of the combination of Ganesan et al. and Inoue to include a message queue as taught by Major et al. because it allows the IOPM to receive the messages sequentially regardless of the timing of the sent messages.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, 16 and 21 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2662

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure are:

- Regan et al. (US 6578086) teaches a database for dynamically managing the topology of a data network.
- Scrandis et al. (US 6816461) teaches a method of controlling network a
 network element to aggregate alarms and faults of a communication network.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Roberts whose telephone number is (571) 272-3095. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BSR 01/13/2006 Page 8

SUPERVISORY/PATENT EXCENNER

TECHNOLOGY OF THE 2000